

AD-A033 855

AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE RICHARDS-GEBAUR AFB --ETC F/G 17/2
PROJECT RIVET STANDARD. (U)

JUL 76 R A BROWN

UNCLASSIFIED

AFCS/EPEX-TR-77-5

NL

] OF |
AD
A033855



END

DATE
FILED

2-77

ADA033855

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (Block 1a or Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 14 AFCS/EPEX-TR-77-5	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) 6 PROJECT RIVET STANDARD	5. TYPE OF REPORT OR DATA	
	Final 13 Mar 75 - 22 Jun 76	
	6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NUMBER	
7. AUTHOR(s) 9 Squadron Leader R. A. Brown	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) Rept.	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS AFCS/EPEX Richards-Gebaur AFB MO 64030	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 1842 EEG/TSM Richards-Gebaur AFB MO 64030	11. REPORT DATE 11 7 Jul 76	
12. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) 1842 EEG/DCISD Richards-Gebaur AFB MO 64030	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 12 15P. 17	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) RIVET STANDARD, Standard Facility Equipment List (SFEL), Standard Equipment List (SEL), Advanced Planning Group		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This document traces the history of Project RIVET STANDARD (Equipment Standardization) from its inception and early briefings/discussions to the publication of an Air Force Regulation and a joint AFLC/AFCS Regulation. Contacts with Air Staff, AFSC, AFLC, Sacramento ALC and AFCS personnel are described. Finally, a number of recommendations (including Action Offices) and conclusions are given by the departing AFCS Rivet Standard Project Officer.		

JFB

7 July 1976

PROJECT RIVET STANDARD

INTRODUCTION:

1. The urgent requirement for standardization of Communications-Electronics (C-E) systems and facilities became apparent during the first few months of my tour of duty at HQ AFCS, Richards-Gebaur AFB. Standardization will simplify engineering and installation (E&I), greatly reduce overall life cycle logistic support costs, including test equipment, tools and tech data, and minimize the cost of training operation and maintenance (O&M) personnel.
2. However, standardization should not be applied across the board to all C-E systems and facilities. It should only be applied where it will show substantial resource savings. In addition, standardization should not be applied to those systems and facilities where the operational requirements and/or the equipment design are in a state of evolution and have not yet stabilized.
3. The application of standardization requires the identification of those systems and facilities which are failing to satisfy the operational requirements or which are no longer supportable, reliable or maintainable. Total AF requirements have then to be assessed and installation undertaken by large downward directed replacement programs.
4. The requirements for standardization within Project Rivet Standard extend into the following areas:
 - a. Equipment Standardization. The majority of the major and minor items of equipment for C-E systems and facilities is centrally procured for AFCS by AF Logistics Command (AFLC) through the Air Logistics Center (ALC) at Sacramento. At present, most of the requirements are upward generated requests for small quantities of equipment, and contract procurement should be competitive to satisfy the requirements of Public Law. For commercial equipments, many different manufacturers obtain AF contracts to produce the same types of C-E equipment. This has led to a proliferation of equipment, spares, supporting tools and test equipment; therefore, life cycle logistic support and manpower training has become a very complex and

unnecessarily expensive undertaking. Equipment standardization is required to reduce these problems. Standardization is also required for the hardware which supports the major and minor items of equipment as some duplication exists in the Standard Material List and some Area engineers are ordering non-standard hardware.

b. System and Facility Standardization on Installation. The operational layout of C-E systems and facilities is detailed in the Standard Drawings associated with the relevant SFEL (Standard Facility Equipment List). The layout is selected by the specialist engineers to ensure that the system or facility will operate at optimum performance and enable operation, testing and maintenance to be carried out ergonomically. Unfortunately, standard buildings have not always been provided, so site adaptation is required to enable the installation to take place in the space available. However, site adaptation should not be allowed when the performance of the system or facility will be degraded. In many instances, HQ AFCS Standard Drawings have been destandardized by the subordinate Area Headquarters and until these anomalies are rectified, different Areas will install the same facility in different ways. Firm control is required in order to ensure that the layout of systems and facilities is standardized so that deviations are not allowed when they will degrade operational performance.

c. Plant-in-Place Management. When the systems and facilities are installed, they are transitioned to the Operation and Maintenance (OGM) agency. After this transition, equipment is often moved to satisfy local requirements without regard to the effect upon the overall performance of the system or facility. Control of the plant-in-place is a continuing requirement throughout the life cycle of the system or facility and the existing Plant-in-Place Records require upgrading for this purpose. Standardization of the content and accuracy of these records and procedures to introduce firm Plant-in-Place management is necessary.

5. Investigation into means of achieving equipment standardization has involved the Armed Services Procurement Regulations (ASPRs) and American Public Law. Several procurement options, such as a Determination and Finding (D and F) and the purchase of technical reprocurement data, were investigated. These could satisfy the requirement for equipment standardization. System and facility standardization on installation can be achieved by standardizing

the HQ AFCS and the Area Standard Drawings and introducing firm control of site adaptation of the drawings. Standardization of Plant-in-Place Records and the introduction of firm Plant-in-Place Management will be a satisfactory means of retaining control of system and facility layout after transition to the O&M agency.

6. After identifying the means to achieve the aims of the project, work commenced on 13 March 1975 with the Air Staff (AS) at the Pentagon where presentations and discussions with the various staffs received their support. A plan of action was drawn up and agreed upon and an AS Rivet Standard Project Officer was designated within the Office of "Engineering and Supply - CEM Systems Support Branch" (HQ USAF/LGYKE, AUTOVON 227-1931). The Branch Chief is Lt Col Kissler; his Deputy is Lt Col MacDonald. The AS Project Officer was Mr. Dick Ventry who was recently replaced by Captain Pierre Albright.

7. As the Project depends on SFELs (printed and distributed by Air Force Logistics Command) and Standard Equipment (centrally procured by Air Force Logistics Command), the next place visited was HQ Air Force Logistics Command (HQ AFLC) on 3 June 1975. Presentations, briefings, and discussions achieved the strong support of the Equipment, Munitions and Electronics Division (HQ AFLC/MMW). The Division Chief is Col D. Dahler; his Deputy is Mr. Tom Jones (AUTOVON 787-6637). He is also the AFLC Rivet Standard Project Officer. It was agreed that the project be taken to Sacramento ALC where the service engineers, item managers, and procurement specialists are located.

8. On 25 June 1975, presentations, briefings, and discussions at Sacramento ALC achieved support from the Logistics Systems Management Division (MMH) and work commenced to establish a common baseline. A joint AFCS/AFLC Command Steering Group was established and, under it, a Working Committee. The Working Committee started work to draft an AF regulation on the overall policy and broad responsibilities for SFELs. The draft regulation was reviewed at HQ AFLC on 11 July 1975 and taken to HQ USAF/LGYEK by the AFCS and AFLC Project Officers on 16 July 1975.

9. On 26 August 1975, the Working Committee started to draft a joint AFCS/AFLC Command SFEL regulation to cover the detailed command responsibilities for the SFEL Program and standardization. This will fill a void as the requirement for a joint command regulation has existed for some time. The Sacramento ALC Project Officer is Col J. R. Rowland, Sacramento ALC/MMC (AUTOVON 633-2350).

The Working Committee point of contact is Mr. W. H. Olson, Sacramento ALC/MMMP (AUTOVON 633-2312).

10. Further discussions about procurement were held at the Pentagon on 16 July 1975 and the ASPRs were reviewed. Multi-year contracts not in excess of five years were identified as a good vehicle for downward directed programs to replace total service requirements with standardized equipment. The following subjects were discussed: procurement by negotiation for technical equipment requiring standardization to achieve interchangeability of parts and to prevent interface problems; indefinite quantity type contracts or open-ended contracts with minimum quantity stated; the Design-to-Cost contract concept whereby the contractor agrees to produce the items at a fixed maximum price per item; Maintenance by Contract Warranty whereby the contractor is awarded the first one or two years' maintenance of the equipment installed; and the Form-fit and Function concept whereby replacement modules and cards which "form" (are the correct size, shape, etc), "fit" (do not produce any interface problems) and "function" (provide the correct output for given input) can be purchased from any contractor, anywhere, enabling the equipment to be obtained from the best source.

11. On 26 August 1975, procurement options to achieve standardization were further discussed at Sacramento ALC. Agreement in principle was obtained for the use of suitable procurement options; however, it was realized that forward planning to give sufficient visibility and assess total service requirements was a necessary factor. In addition, all AF Standard Equipment, which are fully logically supportable, would have to be identified for use in SFELs.

12. By September 1975, project standardization was achieving sufficient visibility and support that it required an official nickname. I applied to HQ USAF/LGYEK for the nickname, Rivet Standard. Rivet is a code word for equipment and Standard is an abbreviation of standardization. The nickname was approved by an HQ USAF/LGYEK message (CSAF/LGYEK 051856Z Sep 75 refers).

AF REGULATION ON SFELS

13. The AF regulation on the overall policy and broad responsibilities for SFELs (see paragraph 7 above) was circulated among all major AF commands for comment/alterations/additions, with myself as the focal point at

HQ AFCS. The regulation was broadened to include Standard Cryptographic Facility Equipment Lists (SCFELs) at the request of the United States Air Force Security Service/Air Force Cryptographic Department (USAFSS/AFCD). Mr. Geisendorf (AUTOVON 638-2165) was the point of contact.

14. The regulation was further circulated in the AF until full agreement was reached. It was returned by AFCS to HQ USAF/LGYKE for printing and distribution on 17 December 1975 and was published as AFR 73-2 entitled "Standardization Communications-Electronics Standard Facility Equipment Lists" on 17 May 1976.

JOINT AFLC/AFCS COMMAND REGULATION

15. The Working Committee completed the first draft of the Joint Command Regulation on 27 August 1975 (see paragraph 8 above). It was repeatedly circulated to, and amended by, the three headquarters involved (HQ AFLC, Sacramento ALC, and HQ AFCS). The regulation covers the detailed interface between the two commands for standard equipment selected to satisfy engineering requirements, the logistic support of the equipment during its life span, the introduction of new equipment into the AF inventory and allocation of National Stock Numbers (NSNs). It also covers the detailed support by AFLC for the AF SFEL program.

16. The Joint Command Regulation, entitled "Standard Facility Equipment Lists - Policy and Responsibility", in its final form, was submitted to HQ AFCS/DA on 5 May 1976 for publication and distribution. It was published as AFLC Regulation 73-4/AFCS Regulation 73-1, on 26 May 1976.

STANDARD EQUIPMENT LIST

17. The importance of being able to identify Standard Equipment; i.e., equipment for which full logistic support is provided, was realized as the project progressed. The allocation of an NSN and Army/Navy (A/N) nomenclature may identify equipment which was programmed for installation, for example, two years ago. However, there is no reason to expect that the equipment will be available now for further installation, or if it is available, that logistic support can be provided.

18. The requirement for the provision of a list of standard equipment was agreed upon at a meeting at HQ AFLC on 26 March 1976. In addition, it was accepted that the list

would have to show for how long the standard equipment was scheduled to have full logistic support. Without this, AFCS engineers would program the use of equipment which would subsequently prove to be unsupportable. As a result, Sacramento ALC was tasked to examine a means of providing a Standard Equipment List (SEL) with projected life span support (in years) for each equipment.

19. On 28 April 1976, the requirements for the SEL were discussed in detail at Sacramento ALC. It was agreed that the first requirement was for the engineers to be able to address a technical data display capability for a specific system or facility; e.g., AN/FPS-6 height finding radar, and be able to acquire the technical performance parameters. The second requirement was for a data bank which would contain the SEL, whereby the computer could be programmed for selective retrieval; e.g., a print-out of all HF transmitters, single sideband, suppressed carrier, with output power of over 20 KW. It was agreed that a microfiche reader with print-out capability would satisfy the first requirement, and a computer data bank would satisfy the second requirement. The microfiche information could be dispatched to users as microfilm. A centralizer computer data bank, updated by Sacramento ALC, with access terminals for users would appear to satisfy the data bank requirements. Quarterly update of the SEL was agreed as a suitable amendment frequency. The minimum content of the computer data bank was agreed as: National Stock Number (NSN), AN nomenclature, Name (definition or compound noun), source of tech data, manufacturer's code ident/model no/part no, equipment status (obsolete, etc), inventory manager (IM) code, unit of issue (each, etc), Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) support, logistic lead time, cost and period of logistic support (years).

20. On 14 June 1976, a Working Committee was set up with AFLC, AFCS and Sacramento ALC representatives, under the Rivet Standard Steering Group, to address the best way to assemble the SEL. Details of how the SEL should be produced and its capability and content were agreed. (See meeting minutes in Atch 1.) Maj Gen H. J. Gavin, Sacramento ALC/CC; Mr. C. Farinha, Sacramento ALC/MM; Col F. St Jean, Sacramento ALC/MMM; Mr. T. Pattan, and Mr. G. Fisher of Sacramento ALC/MMCIA were also briefed independently. All showed their unqualified support for the project.

PROCUREMENT INTERFACE PROCEDURES

21. As day-to-day questions on procurement arose at HQ AFCS and there did not appear to be a satisfactory means of obtaining answers, the problem was discussed at a meeting at HQ AFLC on 24 February 1976. The requirement for a procurement interface was agreed upon in principle and the subject was further discussed at Sacramento ALC on 31 March 1976. It was agreed that a procurement interface was required and that the Sacramento ALC point of contact would be the Division of Program Management (Sacramento ALC/MMCO, AUTOVON 633-4792). The HQ AFCS point of contact would be the AFCS/EP liaison officer at Sacramento ALC, Captain Thomas H. Newlon (Sacramento ALC/MM/AFCS, AUTOVON 633-5858).

22. All queries on engineering and programming matters from AFCS personnel can be referred to Capt Newlon for resolution by contact with Sacramento ALC/MMCO. Capt Newlon will have questions answered, opinions obtained, and meetings set up to resolve any short or long term requirements.

ENGINEERING INTERFACE

23. As part of the project, there is an urgent requirement to reduce the procurement lead time and logistic lead time involved in introducing new C-E equipment into the inventory. At present, it takes over two years from the time at which the AFCS engineer identifies the engineering requirements for new equipment to the time when it is brought into the inventory.

24. Paragraph 3.6(2) of AFR 73-2 defines the AFCS responsibility for the development of new SFELs for projected requirements. An engineering interface between Sacramento ALC and AFCS must be developed to reduce the existing lead times.

25. Confidence must be built up between the AFCS engineer and the Sacramento ALC Equipment Specialist/Item Manager such that projected or new requirements can be brought into the inventory prior to actual programming action. Subsequent engineering standards and installation schemes can proceed then without delay.

INTERFACE WITH AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

26. In order to ensure SFEL coverage of all standard equipment coming into the AF inventory, it was necessary to develop an interface with Air Force Systems Command (AFSC). AFSC introduces equipment into the AF inventory by the AFM 800 series programs. AFM 800 series programs manage the acquisition of both standard and non-standard systems, subsystems, and equipment; i.e., C-E systems and facilities requiring research, developing, and acquisition with subsequent installation, operation, test and evaluation.

27. HQ AFSC at Andrews AFB was visited on 23 September 1975 and a presentation and discussion on the objectives of Project Rivet Standard received strong support from the Systems Acquisition Staff. (Contact there was Capt John Lennox, AFSC/SDED, AUTOVON 858-5055.) It was agreed that the project be briefed at the Electronics Systems Division (ESD) at Hanscom AFB.

28. On 7 April 1976, ESD was visited and a presentation and discussion of the project took place. The chairman expressed his strong support for the project by stating that the SEL would enable ESD to ensure that contractors were using as much standard equipment as possible and thereby prevent proliferation of the inventory and save funds. In addition, the expanded SFEL program would enable ESD to satisfy an operational capability with standard equipment. It was agreed that AFCS require prior knowledge of new systems and facilities coming into the AF inventory. This could be achieved by AFCS receiving copies of the AFSC Forms 56 during its development cycle at HQ AFSC. AFCS could then alert the AFSC Program Managers of its requirements at subsequent system Program Design Reviews, data calls, etc.

29. The question of including HQ AFCS on the distribution of Forms 56 during their development has been referred to HQ AFSC/SDED (Capt Lennox) for agreement. The point of contact at ESD is Mr. J. E. Horowitz, ESD/DR-1 (AUTOVON 478-4919).

30. On 21 June 1976, HQ AFSC was visited again and the progress of the project was presented and discussed in detail with numerous personnel, including AFSC/SD, Col M. F. Chubb. The project was also discussed with Brig Gen P. N. Larsen, AFSC/SD. Full support for the project was

expressed by all concerned. It was agreed that AFCS should be provided with copies of all AFSC Forms 56 to identify C-E systems and facilities which would eventually enter the AF inventory as standard equipment, for which AFCS forecasts an installation requirement through AFR 100-18.

ADVANCED PLANNING GROUP

31. The requirement for forward planning to provide visibility on the performance of all C-E systems and facilities was recognized early in the development of the project. On 16 April 1976, AFCS/XP agreed to set up an Advanced Planning Group at AFCS within the Directorate of Requirements (XPQ). The Advanced Planning Group has been set up and has representatives of all DCSs.

32. Using inputs from the relevant DCSs, the Advanced Planning Group will assess the performance of relevant C-E systems and facilities from the operations, maintenance and support aspects. It will assess the cost of operating those systems and facilities which are no longer reliable or supportable with the cost of upgrading or replacing them with new equipment. Where replacement is necessary and standardization will achieve positive benefits, total AF requirements will be assessed and downward directed replacement programs drawn up. The programs will be coordinated with the MAJCOMs involved.

33. The Advanced Planning Group concept has been projected into a Tri-Command Advanced Planning Group with AFLC and AFSC participation. Thus, replacement or upgrade programs will have tri-command support before submission to AF for approval.

34. The Tri-Command Advanced Planning concept was strongly supported by HQ AFLC during a Rivet Standard presentation on 24 February 1976. It was also discussed and supported at HQ AFSC during a presentation on 21 June 1976 and at CSAF on 22 June 1976. The interface between AFCS/XP and the appropriate AFLC and AFSC planning staffs has yet to be established.

AF PARTICIPATION

35. On 22 June 1976, the Pentagon was visited and a presentation and a discussion of the project took place. After the presentation, Brig Gen V. C. Doubleday, HQ USAF/KRC,

was personally briefed on the project. Full support for the project was expressed by all concerned. It was agreed by AF/KRC that AFCS should be provided with information on projected C-E requirements to form the basis for advanced planning.

36. AF/LGYE has placed a contract with Logistics Management Engineering, Inc (LME) to assess AF maintenance data and produce formulas whereby the optimum life span for C-E systems and facilities can be calculated. Life span logistic support for the systems and facilities will be based on their projected life spans and cut-off dates so support costs will be kept to a minimum.

RECOMMENDATIONS

ACTION

37. It is recommended that AF:

a. Continues to support the project strongly.

AF/KRC/LGYE

b. Provides the AFCS Advanced Planning Group with information on projected C-E requirements to serve as a basis for forward planning (paragraph 35 above refers).

AF/KRC

c. Provides AFCS with the LME reports on the calculation of projected life spans of C-E systems and facilities (paragraph 36 above refers).

AF/LGYE

38. It is recommended that AFLC:

a. Continues to support the Project strongly.

AFLC/MMW

b. Joins the project tri-command Advanced Planning Group (paragraph 34 above refers).

AFLC

39. It is recommended that Sacramento ALC:

a. Continues to support the project strongly.

Sacramento ALC/MM

b. Continues work to produce the SEL through the Project Working Committee.

Sacramento ALC/MMC

c. Supports AFCS in setting up an Engineering Interface to speed up the introduction of new equipment into the AF inventory (paragraph 25 above refers).

Sacramento ALC/MM

40. It is recommended that AFSC:

a. Strongly supports the project. AFSC

b. Joins the project Tri-Command Advanced Planning Group (paragraph 34 above refers). AFSC/SD

c. Provides AFCS with copies of all AFSC Forms 56 to identify new C-E systems and facilities for which AFCS forecasts an installation requirement through AFR 100-18 (paragraph 30 above refers). AFSC/SD

41. It is recommended that AFCS:

a. Increases the SFEL work force within the 1842 EEG to provide SFEL coverage for all Standard Equipment and C-E systems and facilities (paragraph 26 above refers). AFCS/1842 EEG

b. Continues to support Sacramento ALC in the production of the SEL (paragraph 20 above refers). AFCS/EPE/LGS

c. Supports Sacramento ALC in setting up an Engineering Interface to speed up the introduction of new equipment into the AF inventory (paragraph 25 above refers). AFCS/EPE

d. Develop the activities of the Advanced Planning Group to cover all C-E systems and facilities which will benefit from standardization (paragraph 32 above refers). AFCS/XPQ

e. Sets up the interfaces with AFSC and AFLC necessary to establish the Tri-Command Advanced Planning Group (paragraph 34 above refers). AFCS/XPQ

f. Uses the results of the LME reports provided by AF/LGYE as a means of calculating projected life spans of C-E systems and facilities (paragraph 36 above refers).

AFCS/XPQ

CONCLUSIONS

42. Rivet Standard is a long term project to achieve large resource savings by equipment standardization. The savings in life cycle logistics support costs, including test equipment, tools, tech data and manpower training for O&M personnel will be considerable.

43. Downward directed programs to replace total requirements will enable AFCS to adopt a less reactive posture. Fewer and larger directed programs should show considerable resource savings. The engineering effort for the SFEL will be a once only involvement and installation of standard equipment in a standard layout will simplify the work involved.

44. The logistic support of a greatly reduced AF inventory of standard C-E equipment will show substantial economies in financial costs, manpower, management and storage accommodations.

45. The Tri-Command Advanced Planning Group is projected for expansion into a DOD tri-service Planning Group with Single Service Procurement of C-E systems and facilities. Further standardization will show increased savings in acquisition and logistic support costs.

46. A possible further expansion of this project will be for the DOD to address the urgent requirements for standardization in such defense agreements as NATO. This would enable defense to be provided more effectively at greatly reduced overall costs.

RABrown

R. A. BROWN
Squadron Leader, Royal Air Force
Deputy Chief
Engineering Control Division

1 Atch
Minutes of Mtg, dtd
14 Jun 76

Cy to: See Distribution
List

DISTRIBUTION LIST

AFCS/EP/XP/LG/OA/FF/DO/IG

AFCS/EPE/LGS/LGM

AFCS/DAPL (10)

AF/KRCX Project Officer (Capt D. A. West)

AF/LGYE Project Officer (Capt P. K. Albright)

AFSC/SDED Project Officer (Capt J. E. Lennox)

AFLC/MMW Project Officer (Mr. T. A. Jones)

ESD/DR-1 Project Officer (Mr. J. E. Horowitz)

Sacramento ALC/MMC Project Officer (Col J. R. Rowland)

1842 EEG/EPEU/EPEC/EPEL/EPEUI/EPEUIS/EPEUID

DDC, Cameron Station, Alexandria, VA (12 cys)

MINUTES OF AFSC/AFLC
STANDARD EQUIPMENT LIST (SEL)
WORKING GROUP COMMITTEE AT SM-ALC

14 June 1976

On June 14, 1976, a Hq AFSC Team presented current status of Project Rivet Standard to involved D/MM personnel. Sq Ldr Brown, RAF, AFSC/EPEX Project Rivet Standard Project Officer presented the minimum requirements for the AFSC SEL.

Following this presentation the listed AFSC/SM-ALC personnel were established as the SEL Working Group Committee to determine how the SEL could be produced.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Autovon/Ext</u>
Wanda Lombino	AFCS/LGSMS	465-3509
James Julian	AFCS/LGSLM	465-2539
Charles K. Weller	SM-ALC/MMCNC	633-2451
Richard Alley	SM-ALC/MMMR	633-4090
Floyd Kokaly	AFCS/EPEUI	465-3209
Ralph Wells	SM-ALC/MMCI	

The above personnel arrived at the following agreements:

1. That D039 Format 50 would produce a large portion of the required data for the SEL.
2. That a limited printout, FSC 5815 (Teletype and Facsimile Equipment) will be provided by SM-ALC/MMMR and be forwarded to 1842nd EEG/EPEU at Hq AFCS by 23 Jul 76.
3. That AFCS will review the printout and comment on adequacy to satisfy SEL requirements.
4. That additional information required for the SEL is available in various other computer products (i.e., technical specifications, technical descriptions).
5. AFCS requirements for Selective-Random Retrieval of information, microfiche read out capability, dedicated data bank, etc would require USAF approval and funding.
6. That attachment 1 is identified as preliminary SEL Format.
7. That a further meeting of the Working Group Committee will be required to finalize format and establish methodology and time frame to create the SEL.

SEL FORMAT

1. NSN
2. Nomenclature
3. Budget code
4. AAC
5. Proc agency
6. Leadtime (Adm, prod, proc)
7. Specification
8. DSPL def
9. Average life exp
10. PMC
11. Prod
12. Proc
13. Sub sys appl
14. PSC
15. ERRC
16. U/I
17. Price - J005
18. SOS

Atch 1